REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 2-4, 10-12 and 18-20 without prejudice. Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17 and 21-24 are pending. Claims 1, 5-6, 8-9, 13-14, 16-17, 21-22 and 24 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

102 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1, 7-9, 15, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stoodley et al. ("Stoodley;" U.S. Patent No. 6,182,282). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in 1, 7-9, 15, 17 and 23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Stoodley.

Independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 recite either "loading said address for said instruction upon determining that a call to said virtual function is a virtual function call, thereby directing execution to said instrumentation code; and executing said instrumentation code to perform an instrumentation task for said virtual function" or "means for loading said address for said instruction upon determining that a call to said virtual function is a virtual function call, thereby directing execution to said instrumentation code; and means for executing said instrumentation code to perform an instrumentation task for said virtual function." Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations cited above are not shown or suggested by Stoodley. Indeed, page 5 of the instant Office Action states that Stoodley does not disclose performing instrumentation on a virtual function as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17. (Applicants recognize that Hunt, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,491, is cited to overcome this deficiency. The Hunt reference is addressed below in the response to the 103 rejections.)

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 is not shown or suggested by Stoodley. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 7-8, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is also traversed, as Claims 7-8, 15 and 23 are dependent on allowable base claims and contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over Stoodley.

103(a) Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 5-6, 13-14, 16, 21-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoodley in view of Hunt. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 5-6, 13-14, 16, 21-22 and 24 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Stoodley and Hunt, alone or in combination.

Claims 5-6, 13-14, 16, 21-22 and 24 are dependent on either Claim 1, 9 or 17 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Stoodley and Hunt, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17, it is also demonstrated that Stoodley and Hunt (alone or in combination) do not show or suggest the additional limitations of Claims 5-6, 13-14, 16, 21-22 and 24.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Stoodley. Applicants respectfully submit that Hunt does not overcome the shortcomings of

Stoodley. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Hunt, alone or in combination with Stoodley, does not teach or suggest "loading said address for said instruction upon determining that a call to said virtual function is a virtual function call, thereby directing execution to said instrumentation code; and executing said instrumentation code to perform an instrumentation task for said virtual function" or "means for loading said address for said instruction upon determining that a call to said virtual function is a virtual function call, thereby directing execution to said instrumentation code; and means for executing said instrumentation code to perform an instrumentation task for said virtual function" as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17.

The instant Office Action cites column 3, line 50, and column 11, lines 1-2, of Hunt as teaching the claim limitations cited above. Applicants respectfully disagree. At column 3, line 50, Hunt merely mentions instrumentation packages. At column 11, lines 1-2, Hunt merely mentions a virtual function table, but only in the context of making the location of a COM component transparent. The cited portions of Hunt, even in combination with Stoodley, do not show or suggest instrumenting virtual functions, as claimed. Furthermore, even taken in its entirety, Hunt (alone or in combination with Stoodley) does not address instrumenting virtual functions, either in general or in the particular manner recited by independent Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 is not shown or suggested by Stoodley and Hunt, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 5-6, 13-14, 16, 21-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, as Claims 5-6,

13-14, 16, 21-22 and 24 are dependent on allowable base claims and contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over Stoodley and Hunt.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17 and 21-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 8/15/05

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060